



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/670,758	09/25/2003	Soon Yong Chun	091781.00005	2790
34261	7590	07/07/2005	EXAMINER	
HOLLAND & KNIGHT LLP 633 WEST FIFTH STREET, TWENTY-FIRST FLOOR LOS ANGELES, CA 90071-2040			LA, ANH V	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2636	

DATE MAILED: 07/07/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/670,758

Applicant(s)

CHUN ET AL.

Examiner

Anh V. La

Art Unit

2636

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 11-14, 16, and 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Clark.

Regarding claim 11, Clark discloses a security alarm method comprising a sensor unit 12, an amplifier 14, an electric signal, a low pass filter 26, the value of 1-30 Hz frequencies (col. 4, lines 15-30), converting the low-pass analog signals to digitalized sampling values by sampling the analog signals periodically (step 50,52, col. 5, lines 30-50), sounding alarm (col. 2, lines 50-60) if smaller sampling values than a reference are inputted for a certain period.

Regarding claim 12, Clark discloses the reference being optionally designated by a user.

Regarding claim 13, Clark discloses two sampling values being inputted (col. 5, lines 30-50).

Regarding claim 14, Clark discloses a band-pass filter 26, 28, 30.

Regarding claim 16, Clark discloses a broad range from 14 Hz to 25 Hz (col. 4, lines 15-30).

Regarding claim 18, Clark discloses a security alarm method comprising a sensor unit 12, an amplifier 14, an electric signal, a low pass filter 26, the value of 1-30

Art Unit: 2636

Hz frequencies (col. 4, lines 15-30), converting the low-pass analog signals to digitalized sampling values by sampling the analog signals periodically (step 50,52, col. 5, lines 30-50), a band-pass filter, and sounding alarm (col. 2, lines 50-60) if smaller sampling values than a reference are inputted for a certain period.

Regarding claim 19, Clark discloses a security alarm method comprising a sensor unit 12, an amplifier 14, an electric signal, a low pass filter 26, the value of 1-30 Hz frequencies (col. 4, lines 15-30), measuring a gradient of the low pass analog signals, and sounding alarm (col. 2, lines 50-60) if smaller sampling values than a reference are inputted for a certain period.

Regarding claim 20, Clark discloses the gradient being measured in an interval having either the maximum value of the waveform or the minimum value of the waveform as one end (fig. 5).

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yarbrough in view of Clark.

Regarding claim 1, Yarbrough discloses a security device comprising a sensor unit 12, an amplifier 18, 28, an electric signal, a circuitry for determining whether or not the electric signal is 1-30Hz frequencies, a switching unit 37, and an alarm unit 42.

Art Unit: 2636

Yarbrough does not disclose an one-chip processor. Clark teaches the use of an one-chip processor 34. It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to include an one-chip processor to the device of Yarbrough as taught by Clark for the purpose of effectively processing the electric signal.

Regarding claim 2, Yarbrough discloses a condenser microphone 12.

Regarding claim 3, Yarbrough discloses a transmission unit 42 and means of a wire transmission (figure 1).

Regarding claim 4, Yarbrough discloses a low-pass filter 30.

Regarding claim 5, Yarbrough discloses a portable security alarm apparatus comprising a portable matter 10, a security alarm device 10 comprising a sensor unit 12, an amplifier 18, 28, an electric signal, a circuitry for determining whether or not the electric signal is 1-30Hz frequencies, a switching unit 37, and an alarm unit 42.

Yarbrough does not disclose an one-chip processor. Clark teaches the use of an one-chip processor 34. It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to include an one-chip processor to the device of Yarbrough as taught by Clark for the purpose of effectively processing the electric signal.

5. Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Clark in view of Eskildsen.

Regarding claim 15, Clark discloses all the claimed subject matter as set forth above in the rejection of claim 11, but does not disclose a digital frequency filter.

Eskildsen teaches the use of a digital frequency filter (fig. 5c). It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to include a digital frequency filter to the device of Clark as taught by Eskildsen for the purpose of effectively processing the electric signal.

6. Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Clark in view of McCullough.

Regarding claim 17, Clark discloses all the claimed subject matter as set forth above in the rejection of claim 11, but does not disclose a digital noise filter. McCullough teaches the use of a digital noise filter 131. It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to include a digital noise filter to the device of Clark as taught by McCullough for the purpose of effectively processing the electric signal.

7. Claims 6 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yarbrough in view of Clark and Zhevlev.

Regarding claim 6, Yarbrough discloses a security device comprising a sensor unit 12, an amplifier 18, 28, an electric signal, a low pass filter 30, a circuitry for determining whether or not the electric signal is a low frequency signal caused by opening of the door/window, a switching unit 37, a transmission unit, and an alarm unit 42.

Yarbrough does not disclose an one-chip processor and the use of telephone.

Clark teaches the use of an one-chip processor 34. It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to include an one-chip processor to the device of Yarbrough as taught by Clark for the purpose of effectively processing the electric signal.

Zhevlev teaches the use a telephone (col. 4, lines 42-58). It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to include a telephone to the device of Yarbrough as taught by Zhevlev for the purpose of confirming the alarm signal.

Regarding claim 10, Yarbrough discloses the switch unit deciding whether to send signals to the alarm unit 42.

8. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yarbrough in view of Clark and Zhevlev as applied to claim 6 above, and further in view of Eskildsen.

Regarding claim 7, Yarbrough in view of Clark and Zhevlev discloses all the claimed subject matter as set forth above in the rejection of claim 6, but does not disclose a digital frequency filter. Eskildsen teaches the use of a digital frequency filter (fig. 5c). It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to include a digital frequency filter to the device of Yarbrough in view of Clark and Zhevlev as taught by Eskildsen for the purpose of effectively processing the electric signal.

9. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yarbrough in view of Clark and Zhevlev as applied to claim 6 above, and further in view of McCullough.

Regarding claim 8, Yarbrough in view of Clark and Zhevlev discloses all the claimed subject matter as set forth above in the rejection of claim 6, but does not disclose a digital noise filter. McCullough teaches the use of a digital noise filter 131. It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to include a digital noise filter to the device of Yarbrough in view of Clark and Zhevlev as taught by McCullough for the purpose of effectively processing the electric signal.

10. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yarbrough in view of Clark and Zhevlev as applied to claim 6 above, and further in view of Peterson.

Regarding claim 9, Yarbrough in view of Clark and Zhevlev discloses all the claimed subject matter as set forth above in the rejection of claim 6, but does not disclose a switching unit adjusting the frequency sensitive of the processor. Peterson teaches the use of a switching unit 8 adjusting the frequency sensitive of the processor 10. It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to include a switching unit adjusting the frequency sensitive of the

Art Unit: 2636

processor of Yarbrough in view of Clark and Zhevlev as taught by Peterson for the purpose of effectively processing the electric signal.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Anh V. La whose telephone number is (571) 272-2970. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri from 9:30am to 6:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jeffery Hofsass can be reached on (571) 272-2981. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


ANH V. LA
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Anh V La
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2636

AI
June 25, 2005